

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61, 64, 68, 69, 76 and 77 have been amended, claims 62, 63 and 70-71 have been cancelled, and new claims 80-84 have been added. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-61, 64-69 and 72-84 are pending in this application and subject to examination.

Summary of the Response

In the office Action mailed February 14, 2007, claim 76 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for lack of antecedent basis. Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 61-66, 69-71, 73-76 and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar et al. (6,603,968, hereinafter Anvekar) in view of Ala-Luukko (2003/0050047, hereinafter Ala-Luukko). Claims 67 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Ala-Luukko and further in view of Berg et al. (6,876,860, hereinafter Berg). Claims 68 and 79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Ala-Luukko and further in view of Niepel et al. (6,671,523, hereinafter Niepel). Claims 1-7, 10-22, 25-35, 38-46, 49-54, 56-57, 60 and 77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Molne (6,014,561, hereinafter Molne) and further in view of Ala-Luukko. Claims 8-9, 23-24, 36-37, 47-48, 55 and 58-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Molne and Ala-Luukko and further in view of Berg. It is noted that claims 1, 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61,

64, 68, 69, 76 and 77 have been amended, claims 62, 63 and 70-71 have been cancelled, and new claims 80-84 have been added. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejections as follows.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claim 76 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis. Claim 76 has been amended responsive to the rejection. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome the rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without admitting that claim 39 is directed to non-statutory subject matter, the Applicant has amended claim 39 to obviate the rejection. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome the rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Regarding amended claims 1, 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61, 64, 68, 69 and 77, the Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the cited art, taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests at least the combination of features of the present invention of "a single International Mobile Subscriber Identity in the first public mobile network (IMSI-H), wherein the first public mobile network has a Home Location Register (HLR) including a single HLR entry corresponding to the IMSI-H . . . wherein the at least

one signal gateway routes the first and second communications using the single IMSI-H," as recited in amended claim 1 and the similar features recited in amended claims 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61, 64, 68, 69 and 77.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61, 64, 68, 69 and 77 are allowable over the cited art.

Regarding claims 2-16, 20-29, 31-38, 41-48, 60, 65-67, 73-76 and 78-84, the Applicant respectfully submits that each of these claims depends from one of allowable claims 1, 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61, 64, 68, 69 and 77, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to

Application No. 10/782,681
Attorney Docket No. 028327-00068

Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 028327-00068.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Juliana Haydoutova', written over the printed name.

Juliana Haydoutova
Registration No. 43,313

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8469
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810